Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,169	COLAIUTA, NAZZARENO MASSIMO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	J. Derek Rutten	2122
All Participants:	Status of Application:	.
(1) Examiner J. Derek Rutten.	(3)	
(2) Steven McDonald, Reg. No 45,999.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 November 2004	Time: 10:00 Eastern	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	icant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Claim 1 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ. 	the examiner will provide a with the examiner will provide a with the substance of the subs	ritten summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
•		
1. M hu		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated in the Office action dated 6/18/04 that this application would be in condition for allowance if the independent claims are amended to include the features of claim 6. The above features, taken in combination with all remaining features of the independent claims are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Applicant's amendment filed 10/19/04 indicated that the limitations of claims 5 and 6 were incorporated into claim 1 (page 10). However, the limitations appearing in the originally filed claim 6 on page 19 line 29 through page 20 line 2, and page 20 lines 9-13 were not found in the new language of amended claim 1. Examiner Rutten suggested incorporating these limitations into claim 1 via an examiner's amendment, and applicant's representative, Mr. McDonald, agreed.